

artist-architects and "designers," as they have long been wrongly called, will open their minds to the matter, and having mastered the principles of ancient art, and acquired facilities of expression, will give their own genius fair play, and do for posterity what our ancestors have done for us.

"When we bend our thoughts to a contemplation of the genius, taste, and delicate refinement of Visscher, Cellini, D'Arphee, Sansovino, Ghilberti, and many other artists,—when we realise to ourselves their industry and patience as mechanics, and their judgment, experience, knowledge, and energy as artists, we cannot but feel that to produce works approaching, far more excelling, those which have been executed in the past, qualities of the most varied kind must be united. Let the student of design but make the endeavour to combine these in his own person,—let him but struggle to add to a refined appreciation of the highest objects of his art a thorough mastery over the immediate processes of manufacture, and the joint production of his hand, eye, mind, and soul, will then bear the true and unmistakable mist-mark of pure and beautiful individuality."

Mr. Wyatt's elegant book will assist the endeavour, and we again warmly recommend it to the consideration of the public.

FENESTRATION—COMPETITION, AND ST. PAUL'S.

THE criticism of Q. E. D. on my suggestions about house fenestration, comes very opportunely just now, to illustrate part of my argument on St. Paul's. Otherwise I should not have entered into any controversy on things which I had meant merely to submit to the consideration of builders, to weigh, accept, or reject, as they think proper. They are, as Q. E. D. says, very easy to suggest, but when he adds, very difficult to carry out (or rather draw), I must demur, as I have not been able to discover the difficulty in either. However (though having on my drawing-board studies for a brick building, in which all the "rationalisms" he complains of will be practised), I shall not enter into the pencil competition with a "London house-front," to which he invites me; because, first, I do not see the utility of architects who require their work entirely done, as well as cut out for them; and, secondly, I wholly deny the ability of any man, professional or not, to decide between rival systems of building by a glance at two pretty drawings.

Indeed (if I may here digress into a subject of much present interest, though foreign to that in hand), I regard the whole system of choosing designs by drawings (even did they not admit adjustment and fancy shadowing *ad libitum*), as not so much a grievance to us, as a popular delusion of the most ludicrous kind,—an infatuation the most laughable into which their sloth (Englishman's besetting sin, as clear-sighted George Herbert sung long ago) has ever duped them,—did we not remember that its cost in money, inconvenience of every kind, and national dishonour, were far beyond laughing matters. A man or a committee has to erect a building,—a thing to last for ages, and influence, for good or evil, the minds and souls of all who see it, i. e. hundreds or thousands daily:—I say nothing of the more hackneyed but far less important matter of credit or discredit in the eyes of posterity. Well, waiting these, the mere structural efficiency and economy absolutely require a certain amount of knowledge and thought. They find it impossible to dispense with these entirely. Now, the primary error is supposing that the whole knowledge and thought can be delegated to an agent—much, of course, must he so;—the technical knowledge and the art must come of a man learned in building, and also an artist; and it is not necessary or possible that every one who builds be either of these;

but it is absolutely necessary that he know something of so simple and universal an art as shelter-making; and also think something of the work in hand,—more than is implied in choosing the prettiest of some drawings, as he would choose a ribbon for his wife's cap. I know of no other delegated work, from the housemaid's to the legislator's, respecting which so egregious a delusion subsists. In none other is it supposed, that the party for whom it is done can totally dispense with either knowledge or thought of it. Architecture is one of those very few things that are literally every man's business, like cookery or theology; and yet (so averse are we to minding our own business) I defy you to name the art or science so reconcilable and remote from common use, that the general English public of this day shall know or care so little of it, as of this which affects every one every hour of his life. They choose to be (and even boast of being) more ignorant of it than their fathers, still more so than their grandfathers; and probably there is not one in a hundred who knows or thinks as much of it as every one, or at least ninety-nine of every hundred, did in the middle ages, or still does wherever a more natural state of society obliges men to do more for themselves. The result of course is, millions spent to undo what millions have been just spent to do,—a land covered with ghastly mimicsries called architecture, and cobbled failures called "triumphs of engineering," both alike libels on the reason of humanity, and which must render it a puzzle to future ages, what class of the monkey tribe inhabited this island. Nor is it easy to see what can arrest this monstrous and growing bane,—common ignorance of common things,—the ever narrowing into a smaller and more technical class, of knowledge that concerns all, unless it be a well concerted effort to make such matters (especially the rudiments of building) subjects of the earliest and most general education, so as to supply, in some measure that kind of knowledge, or rather common sense, of them, which, in less sophisticated states of society, is picked up fortuitously, and which, from being made more and more technical, seems now in danger of being lost altogether. I see no reason why the parts of a house, for instance (so far as they are deducible from natural laws, not custom), should not be as early and useful a matter of school learning, as the parts of a verb, or of the solar system; and by this means I fancy that by A.D. 1900, we might manage to dispense with tubular bridges, and view the next industrial jubilee without umbrellas.

Well, the advertisers having found (they cannot do without a certain amount of thought, next settle how much this shall be,—say fifty pounds'-worth. Now, it is a fact important to be known by all readers, and all dodgers however sharp, that you cannot, by any contrivance whatever, obtain more than a poundsworth of thought for a pound. We cannot deal with thought as with property or manual labour. We can neither steal it, cheat men of it, nor cheapen it in the minutest fraction of a cent. Mere labour we can cheapen to any extent by keeping our neighbours sufficiently poor: by capital retained for this purpose, we may so weaken them as to exercise this power without limit, even to the degree of making it impossible for the honest ones to live, and so, by driving them all out, placing ourselves alone in a weeded crop of knaves,—but thought cannot be cheapened. No craft, no tyranny, no force, no capital, can elicit from a man one farthing's-worth more thought than he thinks it fair to give us. Do you think, O most sharpwitted committee! that I will give you fifty pounds'-worth for a lottery ticket bringing me a tenth chance of fifty pounds? Oh, no! nor yet five pounds'-worth. For, look you, my sharp ones, you cannot have quite fifty pounds'-worth of thought altogether, because it is a commodity that can only be sold in wrappers, and, moreover, must be weighed like tea, in the wrappers. Now, a grocer will, if you ask him, sell you a pound parcel of tea in twenty papers, but then you will not have a pound of tea, though you have a pound parcel. So, your fifty pounds'-worth of work (be it in one design or twenty),

must include not only all the thought, but also all the drawings (be they cheap or elaborate) in which it's wrapped up. (Apart from buying the most ridiculous ideas, by the by, of the cost of real architectural drawings, in handiwork alone, the public generally seem to look on this as the architect's work, and the whole thereof. They might as well pay a general by the number of words in his despatches.) Well, supposing the drawings worth 5*l.*, then you may have 45*l.* worth of thought, but no more. Suppose you receive ten designs, the drawings of which altogether have cost 40*l.*, you plainly cannot have more than ten pounds'-worth of thought—in all ten. But you can only use one of them, and if the chances are (from your own knowledge and wisdom) that you will have the best, the chances are also (from your ignorance) that you will have that whose drawings cost most, and therefore whose thinker could afford least thought. Well, putting chance against chance, you have, most probably, a pound's worth of what you want, and have paid fifty for it. Ha! ha! Clever fellows, truly! You call this an architectural competition. If you let each competitor build his building, and then choose between them, that would be the only architectural competition. Don't you see? By this plan you make the prize depend not on who can build best, but who can bamboozle you best. O sapient advertisers! You cannot cheapen thought this way, at any rate: you can only drive it out into other fields,—render real architecture impossible,—place it beneath the notice of thinking, honest men,—and insure all your work to the hands of sham artists and humbugs. O clever dodge!

But I must return to solve "Q. E. D." his difficulty, viz. how to preserve the "breadth and effect" of his dearly-beloved "unpretending" Old Clarendon Hotel front, with narrow fenestration; and first I will inform him of the true architectural solution, according to the most approved modern authorities. First, erect your house with its front a few yards back from the street, and, precisely that fenestration, whatever it be, which suits structural excellence and convenience. Then build a second front on the street-line (leaving room behind for light to descend to the real house), and decorate this with just so many and such apertures (square or oblong) as will give your desired "effect," after the Old Clarendon or any other model you may fancy. This is the orthodox architects' principle. There is a fine specimen of it in Wiesbeking,—a suggestion for putting King's College Chapel inside the Parthenon; and I could refer you to many precedents in this metropolis, at least of an upper story so treated (many about the Regent's Park); and in Moor-gate-street the principle was once carried out completely in whole fronts. Indeed the whole upper story of St. Paul's is an instance, probably the earliest.

But if "Q. E. D." prefers the very unprofessional, vulgar, and tasteless, mean and parsimonious proceeding of trying to get utility and "effect" together, in one work (as old-fashioned gardeners do rhubarb and roses in one bed), then the question whether "narrow or crowded" apertures be compatible with "effect," "breadth," &c. is far better settled by old works than new designs, by stone and brick than paper. There is a building on the Acropolis, commonly supposed in tolerable taste, whose whole outer enclosure has more void than solid; and nearer home are many built expressly for this climate (before the window-tax) by architects quite as great as Sir Charles Barry, in which the window voids take by far the chief part of the area (I do not advise their doing so, observe), and yet whose "breadth and effect" I will back against any work of his, before a tribunal of any men except architects (for whose pleasure I presume we do not exultively build). I will only name, as an extreme case, the refectory of Wenlock Abbey (Salop), having two west ranges of lights originally glazed, now used as verandahs. Every old town at home or abroad can yield similar cases. Sir Charles's *magnum opus* itself includes one,—the double cloisters adjoining St. Stephen's.